DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 776 RC 011 255

AUTHOR Burlingame, Martin
TITLE Win Some, Lose Some: Small Rural District Superintendents.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (San Francisco, California, April 1979); Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; Board of Education Policy; Career Change; Case Studies; Elementary Secondary Education; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Patterns; Employment Trends; *Job Satisfaction; *Labor Turnover; *Occupational Mobility; Parent School Relationship; Research Needs; *Rural School Systems; School Administration; School Community Relationship; School Personnel; *School Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS Illinois

ABSTRACT

The finding that turnover rates for school superintendents are highest in small districts has been reflected in a number of studies. To further examine the finding, a survey in Illinois used a stratified random sample of 100 school districts, 32 of which had 499 or less students. With 1974-75 as a base year, the average years served by superintendents of each district over a 17 year span was calculated. Small districts showed the greatest amount of turnover with the typical small district served by four superintendents who served about four years each. Seven districts had six or more superintendents. Seventy percent of the small district superintendents moved at least once in 12 years. The major factor prompting the changes was differences between the superintendents and school board and/or community over what schools should be doing. Career mobility for those changing positions was limited as they generally moved in a restricted geographical area among districts of the same size and type. Examples of vertical mobility to districts with higher salaries and greater numbers of students were rare. Study findings suggested several avenues for future exploration, including examination of educational consequences of turnovers and mobility, inspection of the psychological health of the superintendents, and analysis of victories for superintendents where the process of politics produced success for all concerned or where the moves were upward in job mobility. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

rec 16-04-79

ED168776

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Martin Burlingame

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Win Some, Lose Some: Small Rural District Superintendents

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Martin Burlingame

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Prepared for presentation at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, April 1979. Session 27.22.

RC 011255

There is no single, easy way for researchers and developers to come to grips with the problems, puzzles and paradoxes surrounding superintendents in small rural school districts. Several factors engender this confusing state of affairs. First, few researchers have spent much time or energy inspecting closely the lives of small rural district superintendents. We have few clues about how they come to seek the role, how they acquire or retain this position, how they move from district to district or the general shape of their careers. The research literature barely comes to fifteen articles, a rare dissertation focuses on a few cases, no diaries or logs exist, and little writing about small rural superintendents appears in the pages of popular education periodicals. One must search diligently to find a few scholarly glimpses of rural small district superintendents.

Equally, the very terms we use to identify these superintendents - "small" and "rural" -- are arbitary. Various classification schemas exist in which "small" ranges from 0 to 300, or 0 to 500, or less than 1000 students, or from less than 8, to 10 or less, to less than 20 teachers. "Rural" also has a wide variety of meanings, with few agreements and many arbitary distinctions. These confusions lead to a small, but bewildering, variety of findings about what "rural small" school districts are really like. All too often these districts seem to exist in the category scheme of the beholder.

Developers, who range across the regions of a single state or a regional arena involving several states, find few common themes demanding attention in all geographical areas. Some regions are rich and fertile farmlands, others mined-out or farmed-out wastelands. Some have modern well-constructed and soundly financed school buildings, while many other districts house students in sub-standard, if not downright dangerous, buildings and flirt yearly with financial disaster. Generalizations about the outlines of small

rural school districts do not come easily, if at all. Their variety and shape seem nearly infinite.

For these and many other reasons, those seeking to understand and to provide assistance to small rural school superintendents and districts face a situation so diverse, so complex and so unique as to appear in a shambles, if not downright chaotic.

This brief report presents no catholic solutions to this divergence of opinion, fact and conjecture. Its aims are modest: first, a brief description of the turnover of small rural school district superintendents in Illinois from 1960-1976; second, an examination of three case studies which describe the involuntary turnover ("firing") of small rural district superintendents; third, a brief discussion of the career mobility of small rural district superintendents using the 1960-1976 data base. Finally, the report closes with some suggestions for the study of small rural school district and their superintendents. These suggestions rest upon some of the information generated in the first three sections, as well as speculations.

Turnover of Superintendents

In the summer of 1977 a report was prepared examining the turnover and career mobility of public school superintendents in Illinois from 1960-1976.[1/] This section highlights two elements of that report: the persistent finding across time and among several states that the turnover rate of small district superintendents is high; and, the replication of that finding on a sample of Illinois school districts.

Beginning with research reports prepared in the early 1950's at the Midwest Administration Center of the University of Chicago through two reports on the superintendency prepared by the American Association of School Administrations to 15 dissertations examining 11 states from 1950 to 1975,

one finding is consistent: the turnover rates of superintendents are highest in small districts. While there were persistent differences in category schemes, e.g., whether numbers of pupils or teachers determined size of district, the evidence always pointed to above average rates of turnover in districts with fewer pupils and teachers.

The second task involved replicating this general finding in Illinois. Using 1974-75 as the base year, a stratified random sample of Illinois districts was drawn. Of the sample of 100 districts, 32 districts had 499 or less students. These 32 districts were distributed as follows: 21 were K-8, 4 were 9-12 and 7 were K-12. This group of 32 districts comprised the "small" district sample. An inspection of the districts and their locations suggested that two K-8 districts should be excluded as "suburban" while one K-12 district was omitted because it was created through consolidation after 1960. The final sample then consisted of 29 districts. The average years served as superintendent for a district was calculated by counting the number of superintendents reported in the Directory of Illinois Schools for that district from 1960 through 1976, and then dividing that number into the seventeen year period (17 years or the period of 1960-1976 ÷ number of superintendents counted = average years served). The average years served became a "proxy" for turnover rates. The results of that calculation as well as distribution of actual number of superintendents by district type are presented in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 About Here

While the numbers involved suggest a modest interpretation over the 17 year span the "typical" district was served by four superintendents who spent about four years each in that role. Only one district had a single

Table 1

Actual Number, Average Number, and Average Years Served, 1960-1976, by Superintendents of Rural Small Districts (0-499 Students)

Actual Number of Superintendents		K-8	9-12	K-12
1		1	-	-
2		2	2	-
3		3	-	2
4		3	-	2
5		3	2	1
6		2	-	1
7		2	-	-
8		2	-	-
9		1	-	-
10 or more		-	-	-
Total Superintendents		92	14	25
Total Districts		19	4	6
Average Number of Superintendents	Mean	4.84	3.50	4.17
	S.D.	2.27	1.73	1.17
Average Years Service	Mean	3.51	4.86	4.08

superintendent over that time span, while seven districts had six or more superintendents in a span of 17 years. These figures on the smaller rural districts could be compared to other size districts in the state of Illinois. These districts were part of the total Illinois sample (Table 2).

Insert Table 2 About Here

As Table 2 suggests, there appears to be a curvilinear relation between district size and average number of superintendents (and average years of service). The smaller districts have the highest average number of superintendents, but the largest districts have the next higher average number of superintendents. It would appear that the "safest" superintendency involves districts of from 1000 to 5000 students, with 2000 or so students being the best of all possible worlds for superintendents seeking employment.

The general contour of these findings, however, suggests a series of issues. Just how much difference, for instance, does it make if a superintendent serves 3.8 years or 6.8 years on average in a district? Certainly the conventional wisdom of superintendents suggests that there is both "too little" and "too long" a time to spend in a community. Empirical efforts to examine this wisdom seem infrequent, if not downright absent. Other issues, such as superintendents who "specialize" in building new facilities or closing underutilized schools, revamping curriculum offerings by districts or "cleaning house" so that a successor may rebuild a district, present a possibly cluttered research agenda. The initial array of data about turnover begs for further examination on a number of different fronts.

Hence, the analysis of Illinois data supported the persistent conclusions of earlier studies. Superintendents who served in small Illinois districts, much like those in an earlier 1953 study of Midwestern districts, "swiftly come and swiftly go".[2/]

Table 2

Average Number of Superintendents and Average Years of Superintendents' Service, All Districts, 1960-1976, by District Size

District Size	Average Number of Superintendents	Average Years of Service and Ranking from Low to High	
0-499			
N = 29 (rural)	4.45	3.82	
N = 30* (all)	4.44	3.85	(1)
500-999			
N = 22*	3.45	4.93	(2)
1000-1499			
N = 10*	2.70	6.30	(5)
1500 - 1999			
N = 6*	2.50	6.80	(6)
2000 - 4999			
N = 14*	2.93	5.80	(4)
5000 or more			
N = 7*	3.14	5.40	(3)

*Omit districts affected by consolidation from 1960-1976. Total districts equals 89.

Case Studies of Involuntary Turnover

The work on turnover rates triggered efforts to examine how others had explained these swift comings and goings, and to explore the validity of these explanations in Illinois.[3/]

Peters found that two general explanations of superintendent turnover dominate the literature: the personalistic and the political. Those who explained dismissal and turnover from the personalistic point of view stressed the importance of the school board-superintendent relationship. These researchers suggested key problems involved those such as unclear expectations between superintendents and school boards, communication failures between these parties, and failures by superintendents to implement board policies. In contrast, the political view of dismissal suggested that changes in the community lead first to changes on the school board, then to dismissal of the superintendent. These researchers argued that the key problem dealt with the kind of education the school would offer. Demands by new community members for changes in the curriculum, for example, either were met by the board and superintendent or else the newcomers eventually gained control of the board and dismissed the superintendent.

In order to sharpen differences between these two models of superintendent dismissal, Peters developed two scenarios from the research reviewed. These are presented as Figure 1.

Insert Figure 1 About Here

The personalistic places relations between the board and the superintendent at the center of the scenario. The board becomes "disenchanted" with certain personal qualities of the superintendent. Acting on their own initiative, the members of the board act as the agents of change and dismiss the superintendent. The process of hiring a new superintendent is guided by personal-

Personalistic Scenario of Dismissal

1. Board of Education acts as direct agents of change → 2. Board acts on own initiative to assess Superintendent → 3. Changes in Board opinions regarding personal qualities of Superintendent → 4. Dismissal, replacement with little concern for changing schools

Political Scenario of Dismissal

1. Board of Education responds to underlying political forces in community → 2. Changes in community (social, economic, political) result in community conflict (contested elections) → 3. Board has new members who demand changes in schools → 4. Dismissal, replacement with great concern for changing schools

Figure 1

Two scenarios of superintendent dismissal

Source: Adapted from Peters, pages 14-17.

istic considerations and not by concerns for making major changes in the schools.[4/]

The political places the relations between community and the board-superintendent at the heart of the scenario. Some rapid change in community conditions, such as the development of a new housing subdivision, results in demands for changes in the schools. The incumbent board-superintendent reject these demands. The newcomers are successful in defeating incumbent board members, and obtain the dismissal of the incumbent superintendent. The hiring of the new superintendent is driven by concerns for making major changes in the schools.[5/]

Peters examined these two explanations in three case studies of involuntary turnover in small rural districts in Illinois.

For the sake of brevity, this paper reviews only the highpoints of each case. Several factors are common in all three case studies. First, the districts have fewer than 500 students -- the mean of the three districts is less than 300. Equally, the districts are all located in wealthy farming areas of the state. The production of corn and soy beans is the dominant economic force. Third, these districts have experienced in the recent past or are facing in the immediate future consolidation into larger districts. Also, all the districts had been remarkably stable in size, but now are facing declining enrollments (on the order of 6-8% per year into the early 1990's). Finally, the districts present the image of being pleased with their schools. They bask in the glory of athletic victory, groan in defeat and generally are proud of their "kids" and "schools". With this introduction, we now turn to a summary of the three cases.

Small Town. The case of the dismissal of Superintendent Cord clearly fit the political scenario of dismissal. The precipitating event was the

consolidation of three small districts into one larger unit. This major environmental change loomed large in the fourteen interviews conducted.

In general, respondents were dissatisfied with Cord's inabilities to organize and to manage effectively the newly consolidated district. Complaints centered around a host of topics -- inability to get pupil transportation arranged, failure to press the faculty for a stronger emphasis on basic education, weak support for athletic programs, insensitivity to the needs of special education, lack of universal rules and policies, little or no communication with citizens about their expectations for schools. As the first superintendent of this "new" district, Cord failed to develop the necessary administrative mechanisms and to make policy choices which matched those of the constituents. He did not deliver what they saw as critical to the schools.

T-Town. While it is clear that Superintendent Given was not well-liked (four of 16 interviewees thought him insensitive to the community), his dismissal as superintendent of T-Town seemed based upon two major problems. First, he continued to support a building principal who was disliked by the community. This support alienated both community members and teachers. Both of these groups took their appeals directly to the Board. Second, Given's successor as superintendent was a locally born and raised educator. He had made clear not only his interests in the superintendency but also in removing the disliked principal by combining the superintendent-principal into a single role. Given's failure to act decisively in releasing what the community believed to be an incompetent principal, and a successor who promised to act decisively on this and other matters, resulted in dismissal.

City Town. The dismissal of Superintendent Hoffman by the Board reflected the general desires of the community. Hoffman had come to the community with the reputation of an innovative educator. In his early years he had begun a number of new curriculum programs. But as revenues declined, the

Board and community rejected Hoffman's financial solutions. Conflict between the Board-community and Hoffman accelerated, and Hoffman's philosophies of education and human capital were rejected. The community felt the schools had to cut costs.

Those interviewed in City Town were upset with Hoffman's tendency to fight with the Board about administrative and policy issues. They believed that the Board was responsible to the community, and that the superintendent was hired to provide the community what it wanted for its children in their schools. Even though they found Hoffman to be "arrogant" and to show his wealth conspiciously (a large home built after accepting the position), the community tolerated these affronts just as long as Hoffman ran a good educational program.

Summary. In general, Peters argued that the political scenario of dismissal provided the sounder explanation for his three case studies. He suggested that the linkage between superintendent and community expectations about schools was more significant in small rural districts than relations between board and superintendent. The boards in these cases appeared to be conduits of community sentiments, with members who retained their elected positions deeply concerned with reflecting community desires. If board members did seek to establish or to generate public opinion, they checked carefully with members of the community before continuing such efforts.

The picture which emerged from Peter's work was one of active community involvement in the schools. This involvement covered a wide range of topics, including discipline, athletics, busing, and costs. The one element of the political scenario which was lacking in all three cases, however, was that of marked changes in the community. In Small Town, consolidation of districts fitted this category. But in T-Town and City Town, such dramatic changes were less apparent. It was clear in both these cases, however, that interest

by community members in the business of schooling was high, and that decisions made by superintendent-board were seen as "changes" by the community.

Career Mobility

What sense could be made of these turnover figures and case studies on the careers of small rural district superintendents? Two potential patterns were developed to explain the career mobility of these superintendents. First, following the works of Carlson,[6] superintendents could be classified as either career-bound or place-bound. Career-bound superintendents move from district to district, seeking not only to increase their income but also to serve in more prestigious districts. They are viewed by the board as outsiders, brought to districts to upset the status quo. Place-bound superintendents, on the other hand, are insiders, retained by the board to continue current policies and practices. Their careers are spent in a single district, moving upward through a series of administrative positions. Finally, Carlson and others[7] found that most career-bound superintendents did move horizontally, not vertically. Instead of capturing more prestigious districts and huge salary increases, superintendents move horizontally to districts of the same size and wealth. Only a few climbed up the career ladder.

The second explanation was that developed by March and March.[8] In their study of Wisconsin school superintendents from 1940-1972, these researchers found almost random careers. Using notions such as vacancy chains, match, and length and stability of careers, March and March suggested that a random model provided fairly powerful explanation of their data. While they did note some deviations, their general sense was that no single model explained the motions through time and space of Wisconsin superintendents.

Returning to the Illinois turnover data,[9] information was available on 30 individuals who had served as superintendents of small districts (less

than 500 pupils). Of these 30, 14 individuals had more than eight years experience as superintendents, and records were available for these individuals for 12 or more years. (The State of Illinois has maintained Teacher Service Record (TSR) computer tapes since 1964-65, creating a 13-year file.)

The mobility of these superintendents is reflected in Table 3. Only

---

Insert Table 3 About Here

---

four had spent the time span serving in a single school district. The remaining 10 had moved at least once, with one individual serving in five districts in 12 years.

These moves were then plotted geographically, and public records of salaries were inspected. With one notable exception, most of these moves either were in the same county or were to a neighboring county. Equally, the receiving districts were generally the same size and the same type (K-8, 9-12, K-12). Typical of this general pattern was a superintendent who worked in three 9-12 districts with some 400 students each in the northern third of the state. The one notable exception had the following career mobility pattern: elementary teacher in a K-12 district of 1000 in the southeastern corner of the state to a superintendent of a small K-8 district in the north central area to high school teacher in the southwestern tip of the state to superintendent in a small K-12 district in that region to leaving the field of education in the state of Illinois. This remarkable record was achieved in 12 years.

Salaries of the 10 superintendents who moved reflected no consistent pattern. In most cases, there were modest salary increases (on the order of 4%) when superintendents moved from one district to another. But for many of these moves the salaries received in the new district matched those

Table 3

Superintendents and Number of Districts Served,
0-499 Pupils, 1964-65 to 1976-77

	Number of Districts Served, 1964-65 to 1976-77				
	1	2	3	4	5 or more
Number of Superintendents	4	4	4	1	1

Districts Served	Mean	2.4
	S.D.	1.2
	N=14	

received in the previous year, and there were three moves where the public record indicated a loss of salary.

Again, although the sample was modest, the figures suggest that 70% of small districts superintendents had moved at least once in twelve years, that these moves displayed horizontal mobility within a limited geographic region (or conversely that few cases of vertical mobility and geographic breadth were found) and that most moves involved only a modest gain in salary.[10/] Finally, overall these figures seem to fit with Carlson's notions, although the randomness the March and March argument suggests seems to fit at least one case well. Generally the movement of these superintendents seemed explicable by considerations of location and of district type and size.

Suggestions for Future Study

The research we have conducted provides an initial perspective on small rural district superintendents. In outline, it suggests that these superintendents move frequently from one small rural district to another. The factors which prompt these changes are differences between the superintendent and board and/or community over what the schools should be doing. These disputes over policy range over the treatment of children, the topics of the curriculum, the role of the school in providing entertainment for adults and activities for students, and the proper relation of superintendents to community demands. Finally, superintendents generally move in a restricted geographical area of a state and among districts of the same size and type. Examples of vertical mobility to districts with higher salaries and greater numbers of students are rare.

These preliminary findings suggest several avenues for future explorations. First, and of significance to the general theme of this symposium, we have little understanding of the educational consequences of rural small district superintendent turnover and mobility. An obvious point to be

explored is the relations between the superintendent and the teaching staff of the district. Do teachers stay while superintendents come and go swiftly? Are both superintendents and staff transient? This exploration might well lead to understandings of how curriculum in these districts changes or stays the same over time. Another set of linkages would be that of board and board turnover and community instability or low board turnover and extreme cummunity stability? The usual literature explaining turnover as political suggests instability. A second political explanation would be one of extreme stability in board and community, and the subsequent rejection of outside "alien experts".[11/] A final set of relations to be examined are those among the local, state and federal units of government concerned with education. The demands for compliance with federal legislation, such as Title IX or P.L. 94-142. may create major problems for smaller districts. State minimum regulations, such as requiring the providing of certain courses or setting the pupil-teacher ratio, often stretch the financial limits of these districts. We have few senses of how the regulations of other governmental agencies expand or limit what happens in small rural schools. Hence, the gist of these and other kindred examinations would be to examine settings to ascertain how superintendent turnover and mobility may influence educational consequences.

I wish to carry this line of inquiry one speculative step further. In working with Peters, I became convinced that the popularity of the personalistic explanation of dismissal reflected the unwillingness to explore carefully the fundamental conflict between professional expertise and community common sense. When he examined the personalities of superintendents, Peters found some undesirable personality traits in all his cases. But these annoying traits became significant criticisms <u>after</u> superintendents had sought to

influence, cajol or bully the board and community into accepting their analysis and solutions of educational problems. At the root in all cases were significant issues about educational policy. But when these superintendents were interviewed, they usually began the story of their dismissal by personalistic discussions. They seemed to love to blame problems on others in the community. When the interviews turned to issues, they slowly conceded sharp policy differences existed. But they still wished to tell stories about the folks who got them fired. It was an extremely difficult task for these superintendents to see that much of their problems came from conflicts about areas in which they believed themselves to be "experts". Their faith in their professional wisdom seemed unbounded. In this sense, they seemed to be not only convinced but also the victims of the values of their professional training.

A second general line of research would involve examining in more detail the psychological states of superintendents. What impact does the frequent movement, the conflicts over educational policy and the subsequent personalistic criticism have on the mental health of rural small district superintendents? Such traumatic experiences may be intensified because of the generally low status rural small district superintendents have in the profession.[12/] Prestige is enhanced by size of district and superintendent salary -- low on both counts in rural small districts. Lacking support from professional peers, at what point in their careers do rural small district superintendents either become caretakers who simply "go through the motions" or leave the profession? One might also speculate about those superintendents who do find a home and remain. What are the effects of such self-selection on the educational programs of the district?

These speculations about mental health are tied to our first set of concerns about educational consequences. For while rural small districts

are burdened by state and federal regulations and mandated programs, they are also permeated with the feeling of being controllable. In contrast to the vast bureaucracy of a Chicago, these districts are comprehensible. Their dimensions do not exceed the reach or grasp of most, and it is the sense of self-destiny which makes policy questions so important and political activity so common.

If a superintendent, for instance, takes a politically or socially controversial position, there are few mechanisms of social distance available. Idle speculations or carefully dropped hints ("trial balloons") about future changes in the schools are not shielded from the attention of the community. Gossip carries news. What this fact implies for discussions about educational programming deserves scrutiny. At least one way to begin this examination would be to follow in more detail the finding of Zeigler and Jennings that while small town boards and superintendents have fewer conflicts than those in suburban or metropolitan centers, when conflicts do occur "the likelihood that the board will perservere to victory is significantly higher in small town districts than in either of the other two categories".[13/]

A third line of inquiry about small rural district superintendents must examine their victories. This paper has dwelt on losing: losing positions, losing political battles and losing opportunities to move up career ladders. We have yet to examine instances of victories in which the intended consequences of superintendents are brought to fruition, in which the process of politics produces success for the superintendent, the school and the community, and in which superintendents who wish move to positions they see as "better".

This one-sidedness is less the result of our preoccupation with the agony of defeat and more the consequence of our interest in avoiding entrapment in myths surrounding superintendents. The folklore of school superinten-

dents highlights their ability to work with a community over an extended period of time, their professing the values of education to the community through deed and example, and their upward mobility as individuals within a respected profession. By fixing upon the details of turnover, mobility and dismissal, we were able to inspect what seems to be happening as well as speculating more insightfully about the educational consequences which might occur in rural small districts.

These three lines of inquiry, therefore, may present ways of getting at what is happening in small rural districts. The descriptions of comings and goings by superintendents suggests needs to examine educational consequences of turnover and mobility, to inspect the psychological health of these superintendents and its implications for educational programs, and finally, to analyze instances of victory.

Perhaps if we were to do some scholarly "slow motion" replays of victories, and defeats, we would have deeper insights into the personnel, programs, problems and joys of rural small districts. At a minimum such insights would be interesting, but speculating about their inclusion in training programs moves them from the category of interesting to that of needed. In closing, I wish to touch on an entirely new topic -- training programs. Too much of what happends in small rural districts appears to be the results of self-selection by individuals, not conscious consequences of training programs. The one aspect of the training program that does appear important -- the concept of "being a professional" -- seems all too often to cause major problems between superintendent and community. We simply need to know more about rural small districts, their superintendents, and the relations between clients and professionals in such settings. Until that kind of knowledge base can be incorporated in the development of pre-service and in-service training for rural small district superintendents, we must regretfully suggest that instead of

a matter of winning some and losing some, their slogan may well be "win few, lose frequently".

Footnotes

1. The entire study is reported in detail in Martin Burlingame, An Exploratory Study of Turnover and Career Mobility of Public School District Superintendents in the State of Illinois From 1960-1976. Select Study Committee on School District Organization, Reference Document Number C 128. State Board of Education, Illinois Office of Education, August 1977. (Available in ERIC).

2. Frances S. Chase and Robert E. Sweitzer, "Superintendents in Small Midwestern Districts Swiftly Come and Swiftly Go," Nation's Schools, 51 (March, 1953), 55-58.

3. This section rests upon the work of Mervin G. Peters, Superintendent Dismissals in Rural Illinois Public Schools: A Study of Two Contrasting Models of Explanation. Ed.D. Thesis, Graduate College, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1978.

4. The citations for this model are found in Peters. The majority are from dissertations.

5. Readers will recognize the influence of the works of Iannaccone and Lutz. See both Laurence Iannaccone and Frank W. Lutz, Politics, Power and Policy: The Governing of Local School Districts. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1970 and Frank W. Lutz and Laurence Iannaccone (eds.), Public Participation in Local School Districts: The Dissatisfaction Theory of Democracy. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath, 1978.

6. The best summary of these works are found in Richard O. Carlson, School Superintendents: Careers and Performance, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1972.

7. See, for example, the following dissertations: W.W. Buchholz, Performance of Place-Bound and Career-Bound Superintendents, (1969); M.R. Fenske, Career

Orientation and Career Mobility of Oregon School Superintendents, (1970); and, L.R. Wolf, An Analysis of the Leader Behaviors of Career-Bound and Place-Bound Public School Superintendents in Iowa, (1974).

8. James C. March and James G. March, "Almost Random: The Wisconsin School Superintendency, 1940-1972," Administrative Science Quarterly, 22 (September, 1977), 377-409.

9. Burlingame, An Exploratory Study. . .

10. These findings on small rural district superintendents were repeated in the entire sample of 43 superintendents. See Burlingame, An Exploratory Study. . .

11. Arthur J. Vidich and Joseph Bensman, Small Town in Mass Society: Class, Power and Religion in a Rural Community. Revised Edition. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1978, 1971-197.

12. Ward S. Mason and Neal Gross, "Intra-Occupational Prestige Differentiation: The School Superintendency," American Sociological Review, 20 (February, 1955), 326-331.

13. L. Harmon Zeigler, M. Kent Jennings with G. Wayne Peak, Governing American Schools: Political Interactions in Local School Districts. North Scituate, Massachusetts: Duxbury Press, 1974, 170.